

Atty. Docket No.: 003797.00013

Application No.: 09/892,228

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully ask for reconsideration of both this application and the Office Action dated February 7, 2006.

Claims 1-4 and 6-14 were pending in this application. Claims 1-4 are canceled herein. In addition, claim 6 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 8, and claim 8 is canceled as well.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,324,552 to Chang et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but courteously point out that this rejection is now moot. In an effort to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicants have canceled each of claims 1, 2, and 4 herein.

Next, claims 6-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al., in view of the Chang et al. patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and courteously ask for its reconsideration. In addition, claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the Bezos et al. patent in view of the Chang et al. patent, and in further view of the article "Recommender Systems in E-Commerce" by Shafer et al. (hereafter referred to as the "Shafer et al. article"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and courteously ask for its reconsideration as well.

Applicants first point out that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to combine the teachings of the Bezos et al. and Chang et al. patents in the manner suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner's combination of these patents is predicated upon the assertion that the Bezos et al. patent:

...discloses a client portal for facilitating the purchase of a particular product, comprising a browser capable of retrieving content only through preselected sites

Atty. Docket No.: 003797.00013

Application No.: 09/892,228

that are related to provided the particular product... (See Office Action, page 3, lines 15-17).

To support this assertion, the Examiner referred to the portion of the Bezos et al. patent from column 6, line 59-67 to column 7, line 5.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's entire argument appears to be based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the teachings of the Bezos et al. patent. In fact, the Bezos et al. patent does not teach or suggest a browser capable of retrieving content only through preselected sites. Rather, as plainly discussed from column 6, line 59 to column 7, line 5, the Bezos et al. patent teaches the use of "a *standard* Web browser 112, such as Microsoft's Internet Explorer or or Netscape's Navigator...to communicate with a Web server 116 of the associate's [Web] site 100." (*Emphasis added.*)

Thus, the Bezos et al. patent teaches the use of a conventional browser in a conventional manner. While it also discloses that the associate's Web site 100 provides access to a Web server 116 containing a local store of catalog documents, nothing in the Bezos et al. patent teaches or suggests that the browser is somehow limited to accessing only the associate's Web site 100 or only the documents on the associate's Web server 116. If the Examiner maintains the assertion that the Bezos et al. patent discloses a browser that somehow is limited to accessing only preselected sites, then Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner specifically point out where such limited functionality is described in the Bezos et al. patent.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been led to combine the Bezos et al. patent with the Chang et al. patent in the manner suggested by the Examiner, as the Examiner's assumptions regarding the Bezos et al. are clearly in error.

Atty. Docket No.: 003797.00013

Application No.: 09/892,228

Moreover, even if one of ordinary skill in the art were to modify the system disclosed in Bezos et al. patent to limit its access, as taught by the Chang et al. patent, the combination still would not teach or suggest the features of the invention recited in claims 6-14. These claims recite "a browser capable of retrieving content only through preselected sites that are related to a particular product..." and "wherein at least one of the preselected sites lists sites that are available for preselection." With regard to the Chang et al. patent, this patent does not teach or suggest any technique that would allow a user to add a preselected site. This patent instead discloses allowing a user to extend a search through a specified "depth" of links from an original preselected site. Thus, a user might access a new site through the preselected site. The user could, however, add this new site to the list of preselected sites that the user can access directly.

Similarly, the associate's site 100 would not teach or suggest any technique that would allow a user to add a preselected site with the limited accessibility taught in the Chang et al. patent. Again, this teaching in the Bezos et al. patent would, at most, disclose the use of documents 120 that could only be accessed through the associate's site 100. Nothing in the Bezos et al. or Chang et al. patents provide any mechanism for designating the documents 120 as preselected sites that can be accessed directly.

With regard to the additional rejection of claim 14 based upon the Shafer et al. article Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in the Shafer et al. article would remedy the omissions of the Bezos et al. and Chang et al. patents. Accordingly, Applicants urge that the outstanding rejections of claims 6-14 are improper, and should be withdrawn.

Lastly, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over the Chang et al. patent in view of allegedly admitted prior art disclosed in Applicants' specification. Applicants respectfully

Atty. Docket No.: 003797.00013

Application No.: 09/892,228


traverse this rejection as well, but courteously point out that it is now moot. As noted above, claim 3 is canceled herein, in an effort to expedite prosecution of this application.

It is respectfully submitted that no fees are required for the consideration and entry of this Amendment. If the Commissioner believes that fees are required for the consideration and entry of this Amendment, however, or to otherwise maintain the pendency of this application, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any such fees, including any fees under 35 U.S.C. §1.16 and §1.17, to the deposit account of the undersigned, Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are allowable, and that this application is therefore in condition for allowance. Applicants courteously ask for favorable action at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.



Thomas L. Evans
Registration No. 35,805

1001 G. Street N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Telephone: (503) 425-6800
Facsimile: (503) 425-6801

Date: May 7, 2006